



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,790	12/09/2003	Michael Kilian	E0295.70190US00	4910
23628	7590	11/27/2007	EXAMINER	
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			WONG, JOSEPH D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2168		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,790	KILIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph D. Wong	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 65-78 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 65-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 65-78 are previously presented. No claims are new.

Response to Arguments

Arguments are considered yet are deemed not convincing because they recite arguments not commensurate with the instant claims, arguments not commensurate with the evidence and/or incorrect assertions.

In response to 35 USC 101 rejections, the arguments appear incorrect. First, on page 2 of the instant argument, the recitation of MPEP 2106.01 is out of context and ineffective because it does not respond to the issue of the computer readable media being defined as transmission media issue observed within claim 70. This argument regarding a computer program listing is categorically off point because it does not overcome a reasonable interpretation of the instant claim in light of the instant specification paragraph [20]. Second, on page 3 of the instant argument, it asserts “such as dedicated hardware, or with general purpose hardware”. While the argument only points to a single instance of a statutory embodiment, the claims are broader than this instance. The argument “software can be executed on any suitable process” is simply not commensurate with instant claim 75. Accordingly, 35 USC 101 rejections are maintained.

The arguments against 35 USC 103 rejections are considered yet are deemed not persuasive because they are incorrect. The mere allegation that Cossey does not disclose “storing a retention period in a content unit that has a content address, generated from at least a portion of the content of the content unit, wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period”. This allegation is deemed

Art Unit: 2168

ambiguous because it does not particularly point out what Cossey does not fairly teach or suggest.

The previous Office Action discusses this in the first paragraph on Page 9. The teachings of Cossey fairly teach or suggest the instant claim limitation of instant claim 65 as shown below.

Paragraph 32 states:

[0032] In step 135, a duplicate of the user selection can be posted to the target destination. Unlike editing functions like "move" which can delete a specified user selection from a source location during its operation, the content of the source location from which the user selection was made can remain unaffected by the "paste where" function.

Paragraph 52 states:

[0052] The history retention section 425 allows a user to specify a duration for retaining information used to populate dynamic target destination lists. For example, if a most frequently used list mechanism is utilized for determining predefined target destinations, a user specifying three (3) days in the history retention section 425 restricts a set of recorded target destinations to those occurring within the last three (3) days. Similarly, the clear history button 430 causes a system to delete presently stored information tracked by the system relating to dynamically populating predetermined target destination lists.

Evidence to the contrary of the argument is shown as presented. Cossey recites a user specifying 3 days which meets the limitation of a previously-defined retention period. The content unit address appears exemplified in retention section 425.

Arguments against prior art rejections were considered yet are deemed not persuasive. Accordingly, all claims remain rejected with respect to the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 70-78 are rejected for being directed towards nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 70 is directed at least one computer readable medium encoded with instructions.

The Instant Specification paragraph [20] exemplifies that this product includes “one or more segments of transmission media on which communications may be exchanged between the devices... Each segment may be any of a plurality of types of transmission media, including one or more electrical or optical wires or cables made of metal and/or optical fiber, air (e.g., using wireless transmission over carrier waves) or any combination of these transmission media”. As such the invention is drawn to a signal which is considered a form of energy. This description is evidence that the medium includes signals and as such the claimed invention is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore claims 71-74 are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore is not a composition of matter.

Claim 75 is directed to a storage system for use in a computer system. The element of a “host” can be interpreted according to definition #4 of The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards and Terms, 7th Ed. as including a “spooler” (P. 523) which can be interpreted in the light the art as software per se because (P. 1089 of IEEE) defines it as “a program that initiates and controls spooling”. Also the term “storage device” is defined (P. 1112-1113) to include “data management” or “any medium” in which data can be retained. Reasonable doubt is raised

Art Unit: 2168

as to whether the standard definition is inclusive of software per se. Accordingly claims 76-78 are rejected for the same reason also.

Applicants can look to MPEP 2106.01-2106.02, 707.06 (August 2006), Interim Guidelines, Instant Specification, and contemporary case law with a matching fact pattern for further suggestions that may be helpful in overcoming these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 65-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuart et al., US Pre-Grant Pub. No. 2005/0055519, Filed 15 Dec. 2003, CIP Date of 8 Sept. 2003, Pub. Date 10 Mar. 2005, hereinafter Stuart in view of Cossey et al., US Pre-Grant Pub. No. 2004/0070622 A1, Filed 15 Oct. 2002, Pub. Date 15 Apr. 2004, hereinafter Cossey.

Regarding claim 65, Stuart teaches a method for use in a computer system comprising at

least one host and at least one storage system, the method comprising acts of:

(A) receiving a request, from the host, to delete a unit of content stored on the storage system (See paragraph [0020], Figs. 4 & 9),

(B) determining whether previously-defined retention period for the unit of content has expired; (See paragraph [0020], Figs. 4 & 9)

(C) when it is determined in the act (B) that the retention period for the unit of content

Art Unit: 2168

has not expired, denying the request to delete the unit of content (See paragraphs [19-20], Fig. 9); and (D) when it is determined in the act (B) that the retention period for the unit of content has expired, directly deleting the unit of content in response to the request. (See paragraphs [93-94], Fig. 9)

Stuart does not explicitly teach wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period;

However, Cossey teaches wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period; (paragraphs [32, 52])

Stuart and Cossey are analogous art pertinent to the problem to be solved. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine Stuart and Cossey because it provides for duplicating user selections using fewer actions than are required by conventional editing functions as discussed in paragraph [9] of Cossey.

Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Stuart and Cossey because it provides for duplicating user selections using fewer actions than are required by conventional editing functions as suggested in paragraph [9] of Cossey.

Regarding claim 66, Stuart teaches the method, wherein the acts (A), (B) and (C) are performed by the storage system. (See paragraphs [7, 22-24]; Fig. 1)

Regarding claim 67, Stuart teaches the method, further comprising an act (D) of, prior to performing the acts (A), (B) and (C), receiving information specifying the retention period for the unit of data. (See paragraphs [32-33], Fig. 4)

Regarding claim 68, Stuart teaches the method, further comprising acts of, prior to performing the acts (A), (B) and (C):

(D) receiving the unit of data at the storage system (See paragraphs [7, 39-41]); and

(E) writing the unit of data to the storage system. ([8])

Regarding claim 69, Stuart teaches the method, further comprising acts of, prior to performing the acts (A), (B) and (C):

(F) receiving information specifying the retention period for the unit of data along with the unit of data; and (Paragraphs [32-33], Fig. 4)

(G) writing the information specifying the retention period to the storage system. (Paragraphs 32-42)

Regarding claim 70, Stuart teaches at least one computer readable medium encoded with instructions that, when executed on a computer system, perform a method for use in the computer system, wherein the computer system comprises at least one host and at least one storage system, and wherein the method comprises acts of

(A) receiving a request, from the host, to delete a unit of content stored on the storage

Art Unit: 2168

system (See paragraph [0020], Figs. 4 & 9); (See paragraph [20], Figs. 4+9)

(B) determining whether previously-defined retention period for the unit of content has expired; (See paragraph [0020], Figs. 4 & 9)

(C) when it is determined in the act (B) that the retention period for the unit of content has not expired, denying the request to delete the unit of content (See paragraphs [19-20], Fig. 9); and

(D) when it is determined in the act (B) that the retention period for the unit of content has expired, directly deleting the unit of content in response to the request. (See paragraphs [93-94], Fig. 9)

Stuart does not explicitly teach wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period.

However, Cossey teaches wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period. (paragraphs [32, 52])

Regarding claim 71, Stuart teaches the at least one computer readable medium, wherein the acts (A), (B) and (C) are performed by the storage system. (See paragraphs [7, 22-24]; Fig. 1)

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claim 72, Stuart teaches the at least one computer readable medium, further comprising an act (D) of, prior to performing the acts (A), (B) and (C), receiving information specifying the retention period for the unit of data.

Regarding claim 73, Stuart teaches the at least one computer readable medium, further comprising acts of, prior to performing the acts (A), (B) and (C): (See paragraphs [32-33], Fig. 4) (D) receiving the unit of data at the storage system (See paragraphs [7, 39-41]); and (E) writing the unit of data to the storage system. ([8])

Regarding claim 74, Stuart teaches the at least one computer readable medium, further comprising acts of, prior to performing the acts (A), (B) and (C): (F) receiving information specifying the retention period for the unit of data along with the unit of data; and (Paragraphs [32-33], Fig. 4) (G) writing the information specifying the retention period to the storage system. (Paragraphs 32-42)

Regarding claim 75, Stuart teaches a storage system for use in a computer system comprising at least one host and the storage system, the storage system comprising: at least one storage device to store data received from the at least one host (See paragraph [0020], Figs. 4 & 9); and at least one controller that; receives a request, from the host, to delete a unit of data stored on the storage system (See paragraph [0020], Figs. 4 & 9), wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, determines whether the previously-defined retention period for the unit of data has expired; when it is determined that

the retention period for the unit of data has not expired, denies the request to delete the unit of data (See paragraphs [19-20], Fig. 9); and when it is determined that the retention period for the unit of content has expired, directly deletes the unit of content in response to the request. (See paragraphs [93-94], Fig. 9)

Stuart does not explicitly teach wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period.

However, Cossey teaches wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period. (Paragraphs [32, 52])

Regarding claim 76, Stuart teaches the storage system, wherein the at least one controller receives information specifying the retention period for the unit of data. (See paragraphs [7, 22-24]; Fig. 1)

Regarding claim 77, Stuart teaches the storage system, wherein the at least one controller receives the unit of data and writes the unit of data to the at least one storage device. (See paragraphs [32-33], Fig. 4)

Regarding claim 78, Stuart teaches the storage system, wherein the at least one controller receives information specifying the retention period for the unit of data along with the unit of data and writes the information specifying the retention period to the at least one storage device.

(Paragraphs 32-42)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the amended citations (or new ground(s)) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

If applicant still believes there is patentable subject matter within the disclosure and has reasons why those differences define over the prior art, then applicant can look to MPEP § 324 IV (August 2006) and 37 CFR 1.114 for additional suggestions that may be helpful for overcoming the finality of this office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Wong whose telephone number is 571-270-1015. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8:30AM - 6:00PM and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph D. Wong
TTV/jdw



12 November 2007

Tim T. Vo
SPE, Art Unit 2168



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100